Mr. Martin DiCarlantonio
13B Delaware St.,
Thorofare, N.J. 08086

1/25/90

Dear Mr. Carlantonio,

It is not easy for me to answer your 1/20 questions withour risk of giving you offense but if I say anything I must be honest with you.

To begin with, you banter words around. What do you mean by "researchers" and what is your basis for deciding who qualifies as a researcher?

Louis Witt is not, as you say, perhaps using Marrs' words, "the witness who presented himself before the HSCA" as the utterly nonsensical "umbrella man" concoction. He was subpoenaed. That he was the man who had an umbrella on the north side of Elm Street was published by Earl Golz in the Dallas Morning News, and that is what led to HSCA's interest because its interest was in putting down all criticis and criticisms of the official mythology. As distinguished from the unofficial mythology, the content and an accurate description of most of what has been published on the subject. Marrs book is not an exception.

Apologies for my typing. I'm of advanced years and am recovering from serious surgery. I'll not be able to engage in any lengthy correspondence with you on this business.

Is your judgement so poor that you cannot see clearly that there is no sense at all to the so-called umbrella-man theory? And are you so uninformed on the subject that you don't know that there was also another umbrella man, which is no more than a man with an umbrella, not an unusual event when it had been raining? There is so much that entirely discredits any such theory that requires virtually no knowledge of the actualities of the assassination for understanding.

So, to get back to "researchers," and referring to Witt, you say he "has been generally discounted as implausible by assassination researchers," and this is why I ask you if you really know who is a "researcher" and who concocts theories and palms them off as actualities in the face of all reason and rationality.

If this is what interest you, where in the world do you expect to go, what do you expect to wind up with?

You don't even ask my opinion on fact and reason, instead saying, "I would like to confirm Marrs' statement." You'll do that as easily and as substantially as confirming that the moon is made of green cheese.

You conclude wondering whether "the true identity of the Umbrella Man remains as much of a mystery as ever," which is unreal. There is no real reason to doubt that Witt told the truth and no real reason to believe there was or even could have been anything to any role for any umbrella man.

I'm trying to help you avoid irresponsibility and making a fool of yourself and I'm trying to get you to understand you reflect abyssmal ignorance of the facts of the assassination.

The man who made this umbrella-man nonsense up is one of the finest and most sincere men I've known and he really believes it. Even has his own candidate.

You ask about the Whitewash series. They are 6x9 books, typed copy reproduced by offset, high-quality paper and durable bindings, with extensive facsimile reproduction of documents. I don't really know what you mean by "newsletter-type publications" but whatever it can be they are not. If you'd used standard sources, like Books in Print, you'd have known about my work from other than a literary garbage can.

Harold

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg